

PD-ABP-134

FINAL REPORT

EVALUATION OF USAID/SENEGAL REENGINEERING EXPERIENCES

September 16-27, 1996

Dakar, Senegal

Gloria Fauth

Eileen Muirragui

Contract No. HNE-000-I-00-6031-00



600 Water Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20024
USA

202/484-7170
Fax: 202/488-0754

8

SENEGAL REENGINEERING EVALUATION REPORT

A. EVALUATION GOALS	1
B. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY	1
C. EVALUATION FINDINGS	2
1. Organizational Structure and Functioning	2
a. Roles and responsibilities	2
b. Decentralization and delegation of authority	5
c. Communication	7
d. Vision, values and commitment	7
e. Expectations and morale	8
f. Rewards and recognition	11
g. Innovations and results	12
h. Training	15
2. Teamwork	15
a. Team effectiveness	15
b. Perceived causes of conflict	16
c. Quality of conflict management	18
3. Relations with Customers and Partners	19
a. Activities with partners and customers	19
b. Innovations and local initiatives	20
c. Perceptions of USAID/S performance	20
d. Issues of concern to partners and USAID/S staff	22
D. CONCLUSIONS	24
E. RECOMMENDATIONS	27

List of Tables

1. Quality of Communication of Team as Perceived by Other USAID/S Teams
2. USAID/S Values Statement
3. Rewards Valued by USAID/S Staff
4. Innovations identified by USAID/S Staff
5. Results Identified by USAID/S Staff
6. Sharing Information on Results and Innovations
7. Percentage of Respondents Receiving Training
8. USAID/S Team Effectiveness Rankings
9. Perceived Causes of Conflict between Teams
10. Partner Evaluation of USAID/S Performance
11. USAID/S Staff Perception on their Performance with Partners and Customers

List of Annexes

Annex

1. Reengineering Interview Questionnaires
 - a. Core Team Questionnaires
 - b. SO Team Questionnaires
 - c. Partner/Customer Questionnaires
2. Team Effectiveness Questionnaire
3. Team Effectiveness Comments

d

A. EVALUATION GOALS

This report summarizes the goals, findings, conclusions and recommendations of an evaluation of the reengineering (RE) efforts of the USAID/Senegal (USAID/S) Mission. The Mission, one of USAID's RE Country Experimental Labs (CEL), is recognized by knowledgeable observers as being in the forefront of USAID RE efforts. The evaluation, carried out between September 16-27, 1996 by a two-person team from Management Systems International (MSI) was requested by the Mission, both as an assessment of RE experiences to date, and as preparation for a staff retreat planned for October 1996. Specific goals of the evaluation were to:

1. Provide information on the Mission's RE experiences in terms of organizational structure and functioning including:
 - a. roles and responsibilities
 - b. decentralization and delegation of authority
 - c. communication
 - d. vision, values and commitment
 - e. expectations and morale
 - f. rewards and recognition
 - g. innovations and results
 - h. training.
2. Determine how effectively USAID/S teams are functioning, both individually and with other teams.
3. Gauge the quality of the relationships between USAID and customers/partners, and compare how they are perceived by the respective parties.
4. Provide data that will assist the Mission to make decisions on future courses of action, and include staff suggestions and recommendations.

B. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

Upon arrival the MSI team met with Mission staff to discuss evaluation goals. The evaluation involved document review, individual and focus group interviews, and observation. The evaluation team used a random sample of approximately 50 percent of staff. A total of 47 respondents were interviewed, 23 men and 22 women chosen from each of the Mission's 10 Core and CAT Teams and three SO (Strategic Objective) Teams. Thirteen Coaches and three Deputy coaches were interviewed. Nine U.S. Direct hires (USDH), two U.S. Resident Hires (USRH) and 36 Foreign Service Nationals (FSN) answered questions, as did a Committee of FSN employees. Because of time constraints, a non-random group of five partners was queried. Three interview questionnaires, included in Annex 1, were developed for use with respondents from Core Teams, SO Teams, and Partners/Customers. These anonymous questionnaires were administered orally. In addition, each team filled out a written Team Effectiveness Questionnaire, provided in Annex 2. Quantifiable data was processed using SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences).

C. EVALUATION FINDINGS

The evaluation's findings center on: (1) organizational structure and functioning; (2) the effectiveness of teams, and (3) the quality of relationships with customers and partners.

1. Organizational Structure and Functioning

Reengineering involves changes in organizational structure and functioning based on an a paradigm fostering the flattening of hierarchies, greater decentralization and delegation of authority, and increased responsibility and accountability among those to whom authority has been delegated. RE rests upon a greater and more effective flow of communication and information, a commitment by staff to its vision and values, and the provision of skills and rewards to staff for results. In view of these criteria, the Mission's organizational restructuring was evaluated in terms of roles and responsibilities; decentralization and delegation of authority; communication; vision, values and commitment; expectations and morale; rewards and recognition; innovations and results, and training.

a. Roles and responsibilities

Finding: *A small number of staff were able to describe the mandate of their team in a language that suggested that the team had a shared vision of their task. The majority of respondents gave individual or functional descriptions of their roles and responsibilities.*

Coaches and staff were asked to define the mandate of their team and the role of a coach or team member within the team. The majority of respondents gave a position or functional description. For example:

- Serve the Mission meet its administrative needs.
- I am an Administrative Assistant for an SO team.
- We do information systems, documentation.
- I am an Accountant.
- Procurement.
- I process travel vouchers.
- I work closely to verify bills.

- I am a secretary. Our role hasn't much changed, I am not really involved in reengineering, the work is the same as always.
- I am the assistant and alter ego of the Supervisory Officer.

Role descriptions given by coaches included:

- Team leader.
- Being a supervisor for quality purposes, for example in the development of major documents.
- Getting more "bang for the buck."
- Being a negotiator

Some team members--particularly coaches--went beyond these position descriptions by characterizing their role as:

- To delegate tasks, make sure everyone is involved in the planning of results, such as the development and implementation of work plans, the aggregate of which will be the entire task.
- To foster more cross-sectional contacts.
- To provide guidance and leadership in terms of what customer service is about for SO and Core teams.
- To develop approaches/strategies for more effective results. To interact with other SO teams.
- To give staff more opportunity to take action. To help them be aware of the need to take more initiative and understand that added responsibility means additional accountability.
- To be a mentor. To try to be consultative, not directive and help the team come to consensus--they sometimes want me to make decisions.
- To encourage enthusiasm for the objectives of the program, and to make staff feel good about what they are doing

A small number of team members similarly described their role as:

- To collaborate as needed with other teams.
- To work together and get the point of view of everyone.
- To share the work, information.
- To be more efficient.
- To best satisfy customers.

Finding: *SO Teams generally noted a positive change in their relationship with USAID/Washington (USAID/W), but most staff members reported no change in the relationship. A few noted a deterioration in the relationship over the issue of the authority and autonomy allowed in the field.*

As RE establishes itself, Missions are in the process of defining their role and responsibilities with USAID/W. Approximately 17 percent of respondents stated that there had been little or no change in their relationship with USAID/W. About eight percent of respondents noted that their relationship with Washington was better, and four percent said that the relationship with Washington was more difficult as new respective roles were defined. The remaining 71 percent of respondents either had no past or present contact with Washington, or could not answer the question. Most of these were lower level staff who were engaged predominantly in the provision of services within the Mission.

SO Team members reported positive or improved relationships with Washington. Some SO team members praised Washington for its guidance on the Results Framework (RF) and Results Packages (RPs), for the technical assistance it provided when needed, and the respect they felt they were getting from Washington staff.

Those observing a deteriorating relationship with USAID/W noted that there was disagreement on the scope of creativity that was allowed in the field. They perceived that individuals who were more "out front" and creative about reengineering at the Mission level might "get cut off at the knees." One person expressed a sense of distancing because the field feels it has reengineered, but Washington has not. Furthermore, there was a complaint that the field does not get rapid responses from Washington on questions of field authority and autonomy.

b. Decentralization and delegation of authority (DOA)

Finding: *Staff members have very diverse views on decentralization and delegation of authority. About 55 percent of respondents felt that the process was either establishing itself or working well; the other 45 percent of the interviewees had reservations on the RE process.*

USAID/Senegal staff had extensive comments on decentralization and delegation of authority (DOA). About 55 percent of respondents felt that the process was either working well or beginning to establish itself. The responses reflecting a positive evaluation of the process included:

- Reengineering fosters more efficiency, less bureaucratic hoops, more direct communication.
- In general it works well, except in cases where an individual blocks communication.
- FSNs are more empowered.
- It is a good thing, before everything was centralized between the Director's and Main Office. We needed authorization for everything. Now an FSN can sign without approval of a DH.
- It is very useful, empowerment of FSNs contributes to quick resolution of some issues. We have more autonomy and authority to work on our own.
- Teams are empowered to make decisions on issues previously taken by the Front Office and Project Officers.
- We work more effectively and can get things out more quickly (e.g. PIOTs in 2 days). FSNs can also communicate directly with the Government of Senegal.

About 45 percent of staff still felt either unaffected by reengineering, or had reservations about it. Responses reflecting these views ranged from being supportive yet cautious, to questioning whether RE can work:

- It is hard to change the previous organizational paradigm.
- RE has begun changing the paradigm, yet the attitudes and messages sent still appear to be vague.
- Staff don't yet understand the limits of DOA, which appears to have occurred more at the USDH level, and with the SO Teams.
- The notion of DOA is there, but sometimes the skills to achieve results are not. DOA is not reinforced.

- While there has been decentralization of power, effective implementation of decentralization is not always there.
- The structure has been put in place, concepts are instilled in about 75 percent of staff, but actual empowerment has affected maybe 25 percent of staff.
- It is a work in progress.
- FSNs can sign for small things, but there has been no change at the level of big decisions.
- There are logistical problems with DOA, we need to have ongoing negotiation between Core and SO Teams when Core personnel is deployed to an SOT. We need to plan better as a Mission "team."
- We have been reorganizing until recently, it will take time to sink into the minds of FSNs and some DHs that DOA means accountability and responsibility.
- Decisions are often second-guessed, "higher up" opinions are seen as final. There is a resulting tendency to play it safe and be traditional.
- Not everyone buys into it, both American and Senegalese are still into traditional supervisory relationships.
- We still haven't been real partners with the GOS and NGOs due to USAID constraints. There are few common decisions, sharing of powers. USAID still decides rather than the partners.
- There's lack of communication between bosses and subordinates.
- FSNs are reluctant to step up to responsibility.
- RE looks good on paper, but in practice it is often disempowering. Some functions and activities simply cannot be delegated.
- DOA vis-à-vis FSNs is oversold. They don't have real authority.
- Some technical people reassigned to SO Teams may not be able to maintain their technical skills without adequate supervision from Core Coaches.

c. Communication

Finding: *Close to one-third of respondents noted that communication with USAID/W was easier and more frequent. Staff also rated communication within the Mission as very good.*

Close to 30 percent of respondents said that communication with USAID/W was now quicker and easier due to e-mail, and FSNs are more active in addressing and responding to e-mail. On average, respondents noted that communication with USAID/W and within the Mission was very good. Table 1 compares how each team in the Mission judges the quality of communication with other teams. Overall, most teams were judged to communicate well.

Table 1
Quality of Communication of Team as Perceived by Other USAID/S Teams
(1 = Inadequate, 5 = Very Good, 7 = Outstanding)

ACQ Core	ADMIN Core	Admin Core/GSO	ANR Core	CAT Team	DIR Core	FM Core	INFO Core	HPN Core	Prog Core	SO#1 Team	SO#2 Team
5.3	5.2	5.3	4.5	4.9	5.4	5.5	5.4	4.8	5.3	5.1	5.0

d. Vision, values and commitment

Finding: *Over 50 percent of respondents said they are highly or extremely committed to the Mission's vision and values, and thirty percent are completely committed.*

The Mission's Core Values are shown in Table 2.

Table 2
USAID/Senegal Values Statement

We seek to foster a collegial, participatory and open working environment.

We respect one another, value individual creativity and diversity, and encourage innovation and rigor.

We work in teams to produce results, which are timely and of high quality.

We expect our staff to take full advantage of the unique opportunities USAID/Senegal offers to grow professionally.

We are committed to contribute to the sustained prosperity and empowerment of Senegal's people.

Mission staff were asked:

"How committed do you feel to this vision and these values?"

As shown in the scale below, the evaluation found that 30 percent of respondents said they were extremely committed, and another 23 percent were highly committed. On a seven-point scale, the mean response to this question was 5.3.

Staff Commitment to Mission Values

Not committed					Extremely Committed	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2%	2%	9%	19%	15%	23%	30%

e. Expectations and morale

Finding: *Staff report that reengineering at USAID/S in the last year has contributed to the realization of a number of their expectations. Empowerment (particularly of FSNs), working in teams, and working with customers and partners are the most frequently cited RE expectations that USAID/S staff says have materialized. Staff also cited a number of expectations that have not been realized.*

Expectations realized. Staff was asked to identify the expectations about reengineering that they had last year which have materialized. Responses varied, and respondents often gave multiple answers. The answers were grouped into the following main categories:

1. Empowerment. Empowerment, particularly by FSNs, was most frequently cited by staff as an expectation about RE that has been realized. Close to one-third of staff stated that there has been some delegation of authority and responsibility.

2. Teamwork. About 18 percent of staff members specifically cited the work of teams as an expectation that has borne fruit. Staff talked about the creation of teams and of the new spirit of work as a team rather than as individuals. Some cited the work being done between teams, such as CAT and SO Teams. Respondents citing improved teamwork noted that teams are sharing work more equitably, that there is team spirit. One team member reported that individual evaluations are done by the whole team rather than only by a supervisor. Staff notes there is more communication between teams, and more contact between coaches.

3. Work with Customers and Partners. About 14 percent of respondents felt that a customer orientation and integration of partners was beginning to take hold.

4. Other Expectations. The remainder of respondents cited varied expectations that had been realized. A few respondents talked about changing ways of doing things, of their feeling that a transparent environment was beginning to take root. Some staff members feel they are becoming more engaged, more open to a new paradigm. One secretary noted that after doing the same thing for many years, she could now do new things. Some feel that they are no longer necessarily confined to one task, that they are sometimes allowed to travel into the field regardless of function. Some also talked about the acceptance of results and strategic objectives as a guiding principle.

Unrealized expectations. Several of the unrealized expectations dovetail with those which staff feel have been realized. Others reflect completely separate issues.

1. Empowerment. Although close to 30 percent of staff feel that they have been empowered, they noted that the limits and extent of empowerment and DOA need further definition. For example, one staff member stated that "some of our initiatives are discouraged and that puts a brake on us." Several staff members felt that there is either lack of clarity or double messages as to what people are allowed to do and when. One FSN had hoped that there would be a greater ability for FSNs to make decisions in meetings with officials of the Government of Senegal.

2. Teamwork. Although teams have been formed, some respondents expressed disappointment that teams did not work more harmoniously, both individually and with others. Among the points of dissatisfaction cited were:

- People try to force their point of view.

- There is no coaching, or changes in the ways decisions are made (comment expressed by several respondents of INFO Core Team).

- Bad habits are not being broken, there is competition, no listening, not enough sharing.

- There is non-constructive criticism, expression of negative attitudes.

- In some teams there is failure to even try for consensus and remember the Mission's value statement.

- Respect for one another has actually gone down.

3. Work with Partners and Customers. Several respondents expressed dissatisfaction in this realm. They would have hoped for an improved partnership with other donors, and that the U.S. Congress would become an active partner. One person also had hoped that RE would get more benefits to poor people, but this development has not yet materialized.

4. Change in Policies on Job Reclassification/Promotion/Salary. A major disappointment among FSNs, in particular, is their apparent expectation that RE would bring about job reclassification, promotions and raises to coincide with increased responsibilities and accountability. Several secretaries and administrative assistants who had "topped out" in their grade had apparently hoped that they could become project assistants or administrators.

5. Improved Skills and Training. A handful of staff members had hoped for training to better prepare them for increased responsibilities and empowerment. This response often came from secretaries and administrative assistants.

6. Results and Consolidation of RE. A few respondents felt that the effective consolidation of reengineering is still not evident, and one person wished to see enough of it so that RE could not be turned around. The importance of results and quality control was also cited as an unrealized expectation. One person expressed disappointment with pursuing a strategy of reengineering, regardless of quality.

7. Other. Among miscellaneous expectations that were not realized were: availability of more resources for equipment and materials; the reduction of paperwork; the establishment of the NMS, and the feeling by some staff members that their technical skills were not being fully utilized.

Finding: *Morale in the Mission has been highly affected by the reductions in force (RIFs) and general climate of uncertainty existing in the Agency over the past year.*

RIF Impact. It was clearly evident to the evaluation team that morale in the Mission has been highly affected by the RIFs that took place over the last year. The RIFs had a strong psychological impact. Staff responses to questions about the RIF were expressed by terms including demoralization, stress, sadness and shock. The effects reported by staff included a slowdown in work, increased sickness, and a general malaise.

Impact of General Climate of Uncertainty at USAID. The condition of "permanent whitewater" existing at the Agency also has had a psychological impact on staff. Respondents noted that it influences morale, productivity and commitment, and has focused attention to worrying and survival, rather than work. One respondent noted that it makes it difficult to enter into long-term commitments with partners, either financially or vis-à-vis activities.

f. Rewards and recognition

Finding: *Seventy eight percent of staff believe their work is adequately recognized, but only 35 percent feel their work is adequately rewarded. Recognition of one's work by supervisors is as valued a reward as a salary increase or promotion.*

Seventy eight percent of staff believe their work is adequately recognized, but only 35 percent feel their work is adequately rewarded. Table 3 shows the rewards staff most value vis-à-vis work.

According to staff, recognition by supervisor includes frequent feedback, public and informal recognition, and getting a great employee evaluation. Suggested awards included:

- "Employee of the Month"
- "Employee of the Year"
- A plaque with an expression of appreciation.

Table 3
Rewards Valued by USAID/S Staff

Valued Reward	Frequency of Response (N=47)
1. Promotion/grade increase	11
2. Recognition by supervisor	10
3. Salary increase	9
4. Awards	6
5. Training	1
6. Other	6

Staff also a number of very interesting "other" ways in which work could be recognized and rewarded. These included:

- Using employee strengths more appropriately, giving them more responsibility.
- Getting to be "Coach for a Day" by spending the day with the a Coach.
- Getting a free ride to work.
- Seeing one's work documented in a video.

f. Innovations and results

Finding: *Eighty percent of respondents identified innovations in terms of teamwork, delegation of authority, information systems, cost-cutting and working with partners and customers. Results were also cited, most of which were stated in terms of achievements rather than impact.*

Innovations. One of the most cited advantages of reengineering is that it fosters innovation. The evaluators attempted to gauge the types of innovations that the Mission staff felt had been introduced in the last year. Twenty percent of respondents could not identify any innovations. The responses of the 80 percent that could fall into categories such as teamwork; delegation of authority; information systems; cost cutting, and contact with customers and partners. Examples of the innovations cited are shown in Table 4.

Table 4. Innovations Identified by USAID/S Staff

Teamwork

- Meetings with other coaches to get an idea of what other teams are doing.
- Frequent, regular team meetings for sharing of opinions, information.
- Chief of Party Meetings.
- Team evaluations of individual performance.

DOA

- Trying to be multi-functional and interchange roles (although some skills are not easily interchanged).
- Decentralized maintenance of vehicles; drivers are now responsible for the vehicles they drive.
- Preparing one's own work plan rather than having it assigned by a supervisor.
- New system of floor by floor responsibility for information dissemination.
- Having an FSN Coach.
- Developing the Management Control Plan.
- Writing new position descriptions.

Information Systems

- Use of e-mail.
- Establishing the Intra-Net.
- Installing and using new computer programs.
- Using computers for recording mail.
- Using computers for analysis, e.g. of rainfall data

Cost Cutting

- Maintenance of computers is now done by the INFO core team, cutting down on maintenance costs.
- Invitations to official functions are now computerized.

Contact with Customers and Partners

- Going outside the Mission to meet partners.
- More communication with customers.
- Field trips that include personnel not previously taken (e.g accountants, admin. assistants, secretaries).
- Being more outward thinking.
- Involving key people.
- Broad-based participation in developing RF and RPs
- Asking users before ordering equipment

Results. Respondents enumerated many results, some of which paralleled innovations. Most results were described as processes rather than in terms of impact on customers. "Results" cited by staff are shown in Table 5.

Table 5. Results Identified by USAID/S Staff

- | | |
|--|---|
| ■ Planned and Coordinated visits by VIPs. | ■ Generated the RF and SOAG. |
| ■ Developed the Management Control Plan. | ■ Developed a new EER process. |
| ■ Coordinated Mission input for 1996 IG Audit. | ■ Graduated the PL 480 Program. |
| ■ Reported on seasonal agricultural production. | ■ Carried out a transparent RIF. |
| ■ Worked with partners on RE. | ■ Provided technical assistance. |
| ■ Good negotiation/cooperation with GOS. | ■ Got the RPs to the final stages. |
| ■ Good negotiation/cooperation with NGOs. | ■ The achievements of the projects. |
| ■ Improved pipeline analysis to guarantee funds. | ■ Trained people to use PC software |
| ■ Created a small library for the SO Teams. | ■ Moved the Mission into a new office. |
| ■ Developed the Document Tracking System | ■ Build up a strong and effective team. |
| ■ Did financial review of the portfolio. | |

Finding: *Results and innovations are being communicated primarily within USAID.*

Seventy four percent of staff are communicating results and innovations with others. The evaluation found that these are being shared predominantly with other teams in the Mission and with other USAID Missions (See Table 6). There is less sharing with partners, USAID/W and others.

Table 6. Sharing Information on Results and Innovations

To Whom R&I Communicated	Frequency (N = 47)
Other Mission Teams	7
Other USAID Missions	5
Partners	3
USAID/W	2
Other	2

The primary means of communications is by e-mail, followed by meetings and document sharing.

h. Training

Finding: *Staff members have received limited amounts of training in the past year, most of which was in team building and information management.*

Table 7. Percentage of Respondents Receiving Training

Type of Training	Percentage
Team Building	72%
Information Management	67
Technical Training	22
Management Skills	13
Conflict Management	2
Other	36

2. TEAMWORK

As seen above, the formation of teams was an expectation that was realized under reengineering, but according to staff, their effective functioning is still only partially realized. The evaluation sought to get more insight into the effectiveness of each of the teams in the Mission; the relationship between teams; and the nature of conflict and conflict resolution.

a. Team effectiveness

Finding: *Teams tended to rate themselves quite highly on most scales of team effectiveness including: (1) team goals and objectives; (2) utilization of resources; (3) trust and conflict; (4) leadership; (5) control and procedures; (6) interpersonal communications; (7) problem/solving/decision making; (8) experimentation/creativity; and (9) evaluation. The wide range of scores in the cases of some teams suggests a variety of possible causes: the team members had not acquired a common sense of who they are as a team, or they lack a clear definition of what the team is to accomplish, or there is a good deal of conflict within the team.*

As part of the evaluation, members of all teams were asked to complete a brief questionnaire (see Annex 2) designed to provide data on how well the team was functioning. The criteria included: (1) team goals and objectives; (2) utilization of resources; (3) trust and conflict; (4) leadership; (5) control and procedures; (6) interpersonal communications; (7) problem/solving/decision making; (8) experimentation/creativity; and (9) evaluation. In addition to providing a rating for each dimension on the questionnaire, team members were asked to write down an example of observed behavior of the team that supported their ranking.

Fifty-six completed questionnaires were returned, 37 of which contained comments. The comments are included in their entirety as Annex 3. The only edits made were to remove

individual names so that the feedback would remain anonymous. Not all team members completed the questionnaire. Non-response was due to absence of team members from the Mission, and to confusion about when the teams were to meet to complete the questionnaire. Table 8 below shows how the individual USAID/S teams rated themselves on each of the variables giving the mean and variance. (Data for the Acquisition Core and the HPN Core are not included as only one individual from each of these teams responded to the questionnaire).

The data are interesting in several respects. First, the teams tended to rate themselves quite high on most of the scales. Mean scores for all variables ranged from 4.1 to 5.3, in the good to very good range of a seven-point rating scale. Secondly, the variance between teams was high with each variable having a range of scores from 1 to 7, and variances ranging from 2.1 to 3.9. Third, the comments made were often general and did not report specific behaviors. While the sample size for each team is small, it should be noted that the larger the variance the wider the range of scores assigned to each variable. A wide range of scores would suggest a variety of possible causes: the team members have not acquired a common sense of who they are as a team, or they lack a clear definition of what the team is to accomplish, or there is a good deal of conflict within the team.

b. Perceived causes of conflict

Finding: *Although most respondents do not report significant conflict within their teams, they are aware of conflict between ANR Core and SO#2 Team. Responses identifying possible causes of conflict fell into four broad areas: attitudes and personalities, level of skills, organizational constraints and lack of communication.*

Seventy two percent of respondents said that conflict in their team had not affected its ability to work together. Yet 63 percent of staff members noted that conflict between teams had affected their ability to work together. They specifically made reference to ANR Core and SO#2 Team. Responses identifying possible causes of conflict fell into four broad areas: attitudes and personalities, level of skills, organizational constraints and lack of communication. Table 6 shows the frequency of these responses which are attributed to:

- 1. Attitudes and Personalities.** The majority of respondents felt that conflict was caused by attitudes and personalities. They said some people are very negative, both FSNs and Americans. One respondent argued that some people do not care for decentralization, whereas others like it and have become territorial. Favoritism, withholding of information and "ganging up" on the other team were cited as examples of negative attitudes.

- 2. Lack of Communication.** Some respondents felt that teams do not adequately communicate and listen to each other, and that there also appears to be a tension between team building and inter-team communication.

Table 8
USAID/S Team Effectiveness Rankings

Variable/ Team	Goals/ Objectives	Utilization of Resources	Trust/ Conflict	Leadership	Control Procedures	Interpersonal Communicat.	PS/DM	Exp/ Creat.	Eval.
Admin Core (N = 8)	M = 4.5 V = .286	M = 4.4 V = 1.7	M = 4.8 V = .214	M = 4.4 V = 3.6	M = 5.3 V = 1.1	M = 4.5 V = 3.4	M = 5.0 V = .86	M = 4.4 V = 2.3	M=3.8 V=2.8
ANK Core (N = 2)	M = 3.0 V = 8.0	M = 3.5 V = 12.5	M = 3.5 V = 12.0	M = 3.0 V = 6.0	M = 3.5 V = 12.5	M = 4.0 V = 8.0	M = 3.5 V = 4.5	M = 4.0 V = MD	M = 1 V = MD
CAT Team (N = 5)	M = 6.2 V = .200	M = 6.0 V = .50	M = 6.0 V = .50	M = 6.0 V = .50	M = 5.3 V = .917	M = 6.4 V = .30	M = 5.8 V = .70	M = 6.3 V = .25	M = 5.2 V = 3.7
FM Core (N = 12)	M = 5.3 V = 2.6	M = 4.1 V = 3.9	M = 3.8 V = 2.0	M = 4.9 V = 3.7	M = 5.4 V = 3.1	M = 4.0 V = 4.2	M = 4.5 V = 2.8	M = 5.3 V = 2.8	M = 5.2 V = 2.8
INFO Core (N = 9)	M = 5.2 V = 3.4	M = 5.1 V = 2.1	M = 3.8 V = 2.7	M = 4.1 V = 4.3	M = 2.4 V = 1.7	M = 5.2 V = 1.2	M = 3.8 V = 3.2	M = 4.6 V = 3.5	M = 1.9 V = .86
SO#1 Team (N = 6)	M = 5.5 V = 1.5	M = 4.3 V = 3.5	M = 5.8 V = .57	M = 5.5 V = .30	M = 5.3 V = .67	M = 6.2 V = .17	M = 5.2 V = 1.4	M = 5.6 V = .30	M = 4.8 V = 3.6
SO#2 Team (N = 8)	M = 5.6 V = 2.3	M = 5.6 V = .27	M = 4.8 V = 2.2	M = 5.9 V = .41	M = 4.3 V = 1.9	M = 5.8 V = .79	M = 5.0 V = .67	M = 5.7 V = .24	M = 3.9 V = 1.5
SO#4 Team (N = 4)	M = 6.5 V = .33	M = 5.8 V = .92	M = 6.3 V = .92	M = 6.3 V = .92	M = 5.5 V = 1.7	M = 7.0 V = 0	M = 5.7 V = 3.6	M = 5.7 V = .92	M = 5.3 V = 2.9

Note: M = mean, V = variance and N = number of respondents.

3. Organizational constraints. Several people felt that conflict resulted from the way reengineering was organized. Job descriptions are not clear and this situation leads to confusion and conflict when "turf" appears to be invaded. In particular, unclear roles between Core and operating (SOT) units, could lead the Core to want to supervise the SO Team. A lack of resources exacerbates turf battles. There can also be tension between part timers and full timers on teams. Several lower-level employees felt that management is not open to allowing people to move out of lower level positions, in spite of seniority or academic degrees.

4. Level of skills. A few respondents noted that conflict is caused when some have skills and others do not. Those that do, have not been willing to give them to those who need them, or who could use additional training.

Table 9. Perceived Causes of Conflict between Teams

Causes of Conflict	Frequency
Attitudes and Personalities	13
Lack of Communication	6
Organizational constraints	5
Level of Skills	3

c. Quality of conflict management

Finding: *Staff members have varied perceptions as to how effectively conflict had been managed in the Mission.*

On average, the Mission is ranked as having very good conflict management (4.2 on a 7-point scale), yet the range of answers is widespread and the most frequent answers (N=10) fell in the "poor" category. Although most respondents did not see conflict as a problem, those that do or that are affected by it had strong opinions about it. One person noted that conflict is inevitable and can be healthy, but that it needs a great deal of attention. For those perceiving conflict, the Missions's conflict management is unclear or poor. They feel conflict has been allowed to fester too long, and the root cause of conflict has not been addressed. Instead, they feel that expedient, short term solutions have been taken. One person noted that there is "a lot of mystery" as to how conflict is resolved, "it is not transparent," and there is some frustration about this situation. One person noted: "If we knew how it is done it would help people to know what they have done so as to avoid problems in the future." Furthermore, another person noted that how management approaches conflict and problems is important. If people think they will be blamed for problems or conflict, they will not be forthright or cooperative.

3. RELATIONS WITH PARTNERS AND CUSTOMERS

Reengineering implies a strong customer service orientation, the redesign of business processes and collaboration with partners. Although the reengineering effort is at its early stages, its impact is already being felt in the field. The partners interviewed in the course of this evaluation offered interesting insights into the impact of RE on their work with USAID/S in terms of mutual activities; innovations and local initiatives; the quality of USAID performance, and general issues of concern involved in working together. To gather these data, the evaluation team interviewed a non-random group of five partner agencies. The objective of the interviews was to gauge the perceptions of partners and compare them to USAID staff perceptions. It would have been instructive to also interview a sample of final customers, however it was not possible to do due to time constraints.

a. Activities with partners and customers

Finding: *All USAID/S respondents (Core and SO Teams) report spending on average about 30 percent of their time working with outside partners and customers. Eighty percent of members of SO Teams report having worked with outside partners and customers. Since reengineering began, USAID/S staff members have increased their work with partners and customers, and intend to spend more time working with them in the future.*

All USAID/S staff members report that, on average, 70 percent of their work is with USAID "internal" customers, and only about 30 percent is with outside partners and customers. Core teams, in particular are service providers and work almost exclusively within USAID/S. SO Teams have worked with outside customers and partners to clarify the spirit of RE and the respective roles and responsibilities of each party. Eighty percent of SO team members noted that they had involved customers and partners in deriving results frameworks (RF) and results packages (RP). This process has taken place through the Participative Committee on Partnership and Participation, and through workshops and joint planning in the development of RFs and RPs. Respondents indicated that to varying degrees, partners and customers have been consulted in the development of the SOAG (Strategic Objective Agreement), and involved in developing standard data collection processes, joint surveys, workshops and the development of performance indicators for monitoring. Ninety percent of respondents on SO teams also said that they intend to spend *more* time with partners and customers in the next six months. All partners interviewed during this evaluation also confirmed that since RE began, the contact with USAID staff has been more frequent.

b. Innovations and local initiatives

Finding: *Partners report that increased participation and decentralization are the principal innovations that have resulted from the reengineering of USAID/S. Partners feel that these innovations have contributed to a better incorporation of local needs and greater efficiency in development activities.*

Participation. Partners unequivocally noted that greater local participation is the principal innovation of USAID activities as a result of reengineering. They cited examples such as weekly meetings of the Partnership and Participation Committee, and the involvement of customers and partners in the development of RP and RFs, something reportedly totally new in Senegal. Granted that partners still felt that USAID had its own agenda (e.g., the 400 mm. rainfall zone in SO#2 or reduced family size of SO#1), partners generally perceived that the Mission was more receptive to incorporating local agendas into its activities, and to eventually developing a comprehensive Senegal-based strategy. In terms of participation initiatives and innovations with customers, SO#2 initiatives are strengthening elected rural councils, and the integration of women into them.

Decentralization. Partners also confirmed that they can observe the effects of greater decentralization. Project implementors reported that previously they had to get USAID approval for almost everything, such as for hiring local consultants. They now have more autonomy, somewhat less micro-management. Furthermore, local implementation partners no longer require the Mission Director's signature for carrying out many activities. Approval by an SO Team is sufficient authorization. There is also more periodic feedback rather than a formal evaluation.

c. Perceptions of USAID/S performance

Finding: *All partners interviewed reported an improvement in their relationship with USAID/S during the last 2-3 years. On average, partners judged their overall relationship with USAID/S to be good, the reliability of USAID performance to be good to very good, and the responsiveness of USAID to be good. The timeliness of USAID performance was judged to be fair when USAID/W was involved in decision making, and good when decisions were made only by the Mission. USAID/S staff members judge their performance and relationship with partners to be slightly better than partners' actual ratings. Partners also noted that USAID/S should be evaluated on the basis of other criteria which they independently identified as important: technical assistance, participation and empowerment.*

As of yet, there is no formal performance feedback mechanism by the Mission's customers and partners. Mission staff and partners reported that most feedback is done verbally at meetings, on the phone, or during workshops and field visits. A Customer Service Plan which

will provide a more formal feedback mechanism has been prepared by a local consulting firm, but has not yet been approved and implemented by the Mission.

All partners interviewed had been informed of reengineering and USAID's new way of doing business. They all felt that they had been involved in the planning and redefinition of projects since RE, which had not been the case previously. All also felt that customer priorities were being addressed or beginning to be addressed, and that Senegalese priorities would become more visible in the 1998-2005 Country Strategy. For these reasons, all partners felt that the relationship with the Mission was much better than 2-3 years ago.

Partners interviewed were asked to quantitatively evaluate USAID's performance on a seven point scale, based on several different criteria including overall relationship with USAID/S, and the timeliness, reliability and responsiveness of the Mission. Since the sample interviewed was small and non-random, the results shown in Table 10 should be cautiously interpreted, and considered to be only indicative of all partners' views.

Table 10
Partner Evaluation of USAID/S Performance
(1= Inadequate, 7= Outstanding)

Overall relationship with USAID/S	4.0
Timeliness of USAID performance	3.3 (3.9 when USAID/W is not involved)
Reliability of USAID performance	4.5
Responsiveness of USAID	4.1

These responses by partners are interesting when compared to USAID/S staff's perceptions of their relationship and performance with partners and customers shown in Table 11.

Table 11
USAID/S Staff Perception on their Performance with Partners and Customers
(1= Inadequate, 7= Outstanding)

Overall relationship with partners	4.7
Ability to respond more quickly to customer needs	4.6
Ability to respond more effectively to customer needs	4.5

Partners also noted that USAID/S should be quantitatively evaluated on the basis of other criteria they independently identified as important, including technical assistance, participation and empowerment. Two partners spoke about the quality of USAID technical assistance: one respondent (NGO Support Project) ranked it as very good (5 on a 7 point scale) and another (Agriculture Project) rated technical assistance as poor (2 on a 7 point scale). One partner felt that USAID/S deserved excellent marks (6 on the 7-point scale) in terms of empowerment of FSNs. On the other hand, another partner noted that, to the contrary, USAID top Management had taken away the power of the Customer Service Plan Committee at the last moment, and gave USAID a poor score (2 on a 7 point scale) on the criteria it labeled as "participation." Notwithstanding, USAID is perceived by partners as being the leader among donors in encouraging local participation in development activities. USAID was also cited positively for better transparency.

d. Issues of concern to partners and USAID/S Staff

Finding: *Both partners and USAID/S staff had numerous views and concerns regarding the challenges of implementing reengineering in terms of the nature of cooperation, delegation of responsibility, performance, results, procedures and attitudes.*

Partners Concerns. The evaluation found that partners have the following specific concerns vis-à-vis reengineering:

- Partners feel reengineering is important, and think USAID should use its influence to interest other donors in process. They would like to see more cooperation in this regard among donors.

- Partners feel that USAID should listen more to them.

- Some partners would like less directives, and an easement of administrative and financial procedures once partners have proven themselves to be reliable in implementation and financial management.

- One partner was uneasy about working with FSNs, noting that although FSNs seemed to have more power and autonomy, DOA did not appear to be total and that USDHs could counter FSN decisions.

- One partner would like to be paid more quickly.

- One partner felt that RE was leading to many good things, but was not sure if they would be sustainable.

USAID/S Staff Views and Concerns. USAID/S staff reported that there were multiple rewards of working with partners and customers. Among the most salient were:

- Letting them know that things are different: looking for partnership and results, not just outputs. Doing things in new ways, or adopting innovations.

- Understanding each other better, getting a sense of partnership.

- Seeing the real picture, finding out that they are so knowledgeable, getting better information from them, and working together to collect information.

- Getting a sense of satisfaction of working with people together to resolve their problems.

Yet staff reports that working with partners and customers involves challenges such as:

- Reconciling customer need for timely service with control procedures and financial regulations.

- Dealing with individuals who are difficult, particularly if they demand instant turnaround when they submit their work late.
- The time required to really listen to their needs and incorporate them into USAID work.
- Not coming to a mutual understanding or timely agreement on issues.
- Losing control over certain people/issues, since opening up the dialogue to them leads them to want to question and discuss everything.
- Losing their trust if USAID cannot deliver.
- The existence of outside systems that are hierarchical, have not been reengineered, and are difficult to change. For example, efficient, decentralized communication can be blocked by bosses in outside agencies.
- The dependency syndrome that exists among some partners and customers, i.e. unilaterally expecting USAID to meet their needs without taking ownership for and contributing towards results.

D. CONCLUSIONS

1. Organizational Structure and Functioning

Under reengineering, roles and responsibilities are still in the process of being defined at different levels: between Washington and the field, within Missions, within teams. This evaluation found that the Senegal Mission has made progress in redefining roles and responsibilities, but there is still work to do. The findings indicate that although a number of key players--particularly coaches--can articulate an understanding and broad vision of reengineering and their role in the process, numerous staff members still appear to be thinking of their jobs and roles in a more traditional, non-reengineered setting where jobs are task-oriented and narrow in scope. Reengineering tends to require fluidity of roles and cross-functional skills. Among most of the staff, the mindset and the cross-functional skill level is still embryonic. This situation appears to be particularly true among staff of Core Teams where a "supervisor-employee" mentality still appears to prevail. On Core Teams, there appears to be more reluctance to experiment with new roles and responsibilities. Some people on these teams expressed feeling marginalized by RE. This reluctance to experiment and sense of marginalization make decentralization and delegation of authority more difficult to implement.

The evaluation team heard several arguments explaining why there were limits to delegation of authority: for example, because certain roles are not easily interchanged since they require technical knowledge or skills, or due to legal rules or procedural constraints. Some in supervisory positions seem reluctant to allow teams be ultimately responsible for performance and quality control. Employees may also be reticent to take up new roles and responsibilities for which they feel they do not have sufficient skills, or for which they do not feel fully and effectively empowered. Individuals or teams may hesitate to be innovative or take risks if they feel that final decisions remain with supervisors or with the Front Office, or if they will be chastised for failure.

Notwithstanding these challenges, the evaluation findings suggest that USAID/S is making steady progress in its efforts to achieve maximum flexibility in its internal work processes. Notable examples are in deployment and utilization of Core Team specialties on SO Teams and empowerment of FSNs. Some FSNs have questioned the extent of real empowerment, but others, particularly those in the Coach or Deputy Coach role appear to have done an outstanding job and have "risen to the occasion."

Morale at the Mission has definitely been affected by the RIFs and general climate of uncertainty at USAID. Some respondents weren't sure whether demoralization was the result of RIF or RE, since both came at the same time. The demoralization appears to have affected productivity to some degree, but nonetheless, the evaluation team found that the Mission is in a very favorable position because a significant proportion of staff had high levels of commitment to RE and felt that communication with other teams in the Mission was very good. Furthermore, another good sign is that numerous staff members indicated that a number of their expectations have been realized, such as empowerment of FSNs, working in teams, and working with customers and partners, particularly for SO Team members.

Despite these signs indicating movement towards a consolidation of RE, according to staff, there are still unrealized expectations. Many of these center around a deepening of processes that have been initiated. The issue of rewards and recognition also appears to loom on the horizon. A substantial number of employees are satisfied that their work is adequately recognized, but a sizable proportion do not feel that it is adequately rewarded. Sometimes employee dissatisfaction at this level most affects the best employees, who may seek opportunities elsewhere. Finally, in the past year, staff members have received limited amounts of training in the skills and management issues that can buttress the process of reengineering.

2. Teamwork

The evaluation data indicate differences in the functioning of teams within the Mission. The Strategic Objective Teams are functioning as a team and have a better defined and

commonly shared sense of themselves as a team than do the Core Teams. The comments made by team members regarding the behaviors that accounted for their team effectiveness ranking support this observation. The SO Teams and the CAT Team were able to give clearer behavioral evidence for their choices. Specific comments about the length of time that objectives and goals were discussed before a consensus was reached, or the quality of interpersonal communication during team meetings, or the ways in which leadership was shared demonstrated that these teams had considered these areas and had devoted time to dealing with these issues. The variance for the SO Teams was also smaller, indicating that there is more agreement on how the team is functioning than is the case with the Core Teams. The SO Teams also mentioned a sense of cohesiveness as a team more frequently than did, for example, the INFO Core, where most members do not see it as a team.

It is also clear from the data that all of the Mission's teams have more development to do. One area that generally received either lower rankings or failed to elicit any clear behavioral observations was that of evaluation. Some teams noted that this situation was a weakness. Others responded by describing task related behaviors only, indicating that little attention had been paid by the team to team maintenance or team development.

While most of the teams could describe an objective for their team, it was usually a repeat of the specific strategic objective they were responsible for or some functional role within the Mission. Few teams have a clear set of objectives beyond the task or tasks for which they are responsible. Nor do most of the teams have an agreed upon set of operational guidelines such as might be found in a written team charter. This situation contributes to the pervasive sense of lack of clarity about teams and their role in the Mission's operations. Perhaps the most revealing aspect of this data is that the teams, while still developing and still a little rough in their performance have managed to forge ahead and do what they perceive as quality work. They are excited about their team and its work, and believe that working on teams has empowered them.

The evaluation data collected also suggest that the issues of team empowerment and conflict resolution are important. Some individuals on SO teams felt empowered to discuss issues and develop ideas, but were reluctant to make decisions that would later be overturned. Conflict between teams, and the need for satisfactory resolution is also necessary.

3. Relations with Customers and Partners

The evaluation found that the majority of staff spends most of its time working with internal customers. The SO Teams work more with outside partners and customers. Since reengineering began, USAID/S staff members have increased their work with partners and customers. Partners are pleased with this development, notably because it has led to greater participation and decentralization of decision making. Partners also feel that reengineering innovations have contributed to a better incorporation of local needs and greater efficiency in

development activities. Partners favorably evaluated USAID performance in terms of responsiveness and reliability. Partners would like to see improvement in performance in terms of timeliness. Partners would like to see further improvement in terms of technical assistance, participation and empowerment.

E. RECOMMENDATIONS

On the basis of the evaluation team's experiences with RE in USAID/W and other field Missions, and its knowledge of the progress USAID has made in the last year in terms of reengineering, the evaluators recommend that USAID/S take ten steps in the areas of organizational structure and functioning, teamwork and relations with customers and partners.

1. Organizational Structure and Functioning

To strengthen the organizational structure and functioning of USAID/S in support of reengineering it is recommended that:

1. The Front Office and Coaches develop a reward system that will encourage team members to be innovative and take risks.
2. Business processes that both Core and SO units employ be identified and modified to simplify them, improve efficiency and reduce paperwork.
3. The Mission develop a more comprehensive training program to support reengineering efforts and ensure that cross-training of staff occurs.

2. Teamwork

To strengthen teams in support of reengineering and successfully manage conflict, it is recommended that:

1. All Teams (SO, CAT, CORE) receive advanced team building training. If possible, a local consultant/facilitator who could provide consistent support during team meetings should be hired.
2. Individual teams need to revise their team charter to clarify individual and team roles and responsibilities; define how the work of the team will be monitored and evaluated and what delegations of authority the team has or needs to achieve identified results.

3. Core Teams develop work objectives and a work plan with target dates and indicators so that achievement can be monitored and evaluated.

4. Mission staff receive conflict management training.

5. All teams do more business process reengineering, which is at the heart of successful overall reengineering efforts. The Information Core Team could play an important role in these efforts (e.g. by helping to identify and automate certain business process; by providing access of up-to date information on the Intra-Net; by developing systems to track various activities; by recording activities as transactions amenable to analysis of how and when various teams interact with each other).

3. Relations with Customers and Partners

To strengthen work with customers and partners it is recommended that:

1. USAID/S periodically evaluate how its partners and internal and external customers view the Mission's service delivery.

2. SO teams consider incorporating partners with needed technical skills into Mission teams.

SUMMARY - USAID/SENEGAL EVALUATION FINDINGS

ORGANIZATIONAL	STRUCTURE AND FUNCTIONING
Roles and responsibilities	FINDINGS
	<p>A small number of staff were able to describe the mandate of their team in a language that suggested that the team had a shared vision of their task. The majority of respondents gave individual or functional descriptions of their roles and responsibilities.</p> <p>SO Teams generally noted a positive change in their relationship with USAID/Washington (USAID/W), but most staff members reported no change in the relationship. A few noted a deterioration in the relationship over the issue of the authority and autonomy allowed in the field.</p>
Decentralization/DOA	<p>Staff members have very diverse views on decentralization and delegation of authority. About 55 percent of respondents felt that the process was either establishing itself or working well; the other 45 percent of the interviewees had reservations on delegation of authority, empowerment and the RE process.</p>
Communication	<p>Close to one-third of respondents noted that communication with USAID/W was easier and more frequent. Staff also rated communication within the Mission as very good.</p>
Vision, values and commitment	<p>Over 50 percent of respondents said they are highly or extremely committed to the Mission's vision and values. Thirty percent of those interviewed stated that they were completely committed to the Mission's vision and values.</p>
Expectations and morale	<p>Staff report that reengineering at USAID/S in the last year has contributed to the realization of a number of their expectations. Empowerment (particularly of FSNs), working in teams, and working with customers and partners are the most frequently cited RE expectations that USAID/S staff says have materialized. Staff also cited a number of expectations that have not been realized.</p>
	<p>Morale in the Mission has been highly affected by the reductions in force (RIFs) and general climate of uncertainty existing in the Agency over the past year.</p>
Rewards and recognition	<p>Seventy eight percent of staff believe their work is adequately recognized, but only 35 percent feel their work is adequately rewarded. Recognition of one's work by supervisors is as valued a reward as a salary increase or promotion.</p>
Innovations and results	<p>Eighty percent of respondents identified innovations in terms of teamwork, delegation of authority, information systems, cost-cutting and working with partners and customers. Results were also cited, most of which were stated in terms of achievements rather than impact.</p>
	<p>Results and innovations are being communicated primarily within USAID.</p>
Training	<p>Staff members have received limited amounts of training in the past year, most of which was in team building and information management.</p>

SUMMARY - USAID/SENEGAL EVALUATION FINDINGS

TEAMWORK	
	FINDINGS
Team Effectiveness	Teams tended to rate themselves quite highly on most scales of team effectiveness including: (1) team goals and objectives; (2) utilizations of resources; (3) trust and conflict; (4) leadership; (5) control and procedures; (6) interpersonal communications; (7) problem/solving/decision making; (8) experimentation/creativity; and (9) evaluation. The wide range of scores in the cases of some teams suggests a variety of possible causes: the team members had not acquired a common sense of who they are as a team, or they lack a clear definition of what the team is to accomplish, or there is a good deal of conflict within the team.
Perceived Causes of Conflict	Although most respondents do not report significant conflict within their teams, they are aware of conflict between teams in the Mission. Responses identifying possible causes of conflict fell into four broad areas: attitudes and personalities, level of skills, organizational constraints and lack of communication.
Quality of Conflict Management	Staff members have varied perceptions as to how effectively conflict had been managed in the Mission.
RELATIONS WITH PARTNERS AND CUSTOMERS	
	FINDINGS
Activities with partners and customers	All USAID/S respondents (Core and SO Teams) report spending on average about 30 percent of their time working with outside partners and customers. Eighty percent of members of SO Teams report having worked with outside partners and customers. Since reengineering began, USAID/S staff members have increased their work with partners and customers, and intend to spend more time working with them in the future.
Innovations and local initiatives	Partners report that increased participation and decentralization are the principal innovations that have resulted from the reengineering of USAID/S. Partners feel that these innovations have contributed to a better incorporation of local needs and greater efficiency in development activities.
Perceptions of USAID/S performance	All partners interviewed reported an improvement in their relationship with USAID/S during the last 2-3 years. On average, partners judged their overall relationship with USAID/S to be good, the reliability of USAID performance to be good to very good, and the responsiveness of USAID to be good. The timeliness of USAID performance was judged to be fair when USAID/W was involved in decision making, and good when decisions were made only by the Mission. USAID/S staff members judge their performance and relationship with partners to be slightly better than partners' actual ratings. Partners also noted that USAID/S should be evaluated on the basis of other criteria which they independently identified as important: technical assistance, participation and empowerment.
Issues of concern to partners and USAID/S staff	Both partners and USAID/S staff had numerous views and concerns regarding the challenges of implementing reengineering in terms of the nature of cooperation, delegation of responsibility, performance, results, procedures and attitudes.

RECOMMENDATIONS

On the basis of the evaluation team's experiences with RE in USAID/W and other field Missions, and its knowledge of the progress USAID has made in the last year in terms of reengineering, the evaluators recommend that USAID/S take ten steps in the areas of organizational structure and functioning, teamwork and relations with customers and partners.

<p>ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE AND FUNCTIONING</p> <p>To strengthen the organizational structure and functioning of USAID/S in support of reengineering it is recommended that:</p>	<p>RECOMMENDATIONS</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Front Office and Coaches develop a reward system that will encourage team members to be innovative and take risks. 2. Business processes that both Core and SO units employ be identified and modified to simplify them, improve efficiency and reduce paperwork. 3. The Mission develop a more comprehensive training program to support reengineering efforts and ensure that cross-training of staff occurs.
<p>TEAMWORK</p> <p>To strengthen teams in support of reengineering and successfully manage conflict, it is recommended that:</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All Teams (SO, CAT, CORE) receive advanced team building training. If possible, a local consultant/facilitator who could provide consistent support during team meetings should be hired. 2. Individual teams need to revise their team charter to clarify individual and team roles and responsibilities; define how the work of the team will be monitored and evaluated and what delegations of authority the team has or needs to achieve identified results. 3. Core Teams develop work objectives and a work plan with target dates and indicators so that achievement can be monitored and evaluated. 4. Mission staff receive conflict management training. 5. All teams do more business process reengineering, which is at the heart of successful overall reengineering efforts. The Information Core Team could play an important role in these efforts (e.g. by helping to identify and automate certain business process; by providing access of up-to date information on the Intra-Net; by developing systems to track various activities; by recording activities as transactions amenable to analysis of how and when various teams interact with each other).
<p>RELATIONS WITH PARTNERS AND CUSTOMERS</p> <p>To strengthen work with customers and partners it is recommended that:</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. USAID/S periodically evaluate how its partners and internal and external customers view the Mission's service delivery. 2. SO teams consider incorporating partners with needed technical skills into Mission teams.

Annex 1. Reengineering Interview Questionnaires

- a. Core Team Questionnaires
- b. SO Team Questionnaires
- c. Partner/Customer Questionnaires

Team: _____

0.0 _____ Coach _____ Team Member
0.1 _____ FSN _____ U.S.DH or RH

QUESTIONNAIRE — Core COACHES/Core Team Members

1. ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE AND FUNCTIONING

1.1 On what team do you serve?

1.2 What is the mandate of this team?

1.3 How well do you feel the new organizational structure of USAID/S functions in terms of ability to:

1. respond more quickly to customer needs

Inadequate	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

2. respond more effectively to customer needs

Inadequate	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

3. avoid duplication of effort within USAID

Inadequate	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Roles and responsibilities

1.4 How do you define your role as coach/team member?

1.5 What has changed about your team's relationship with USAID/Washington?

1.6 How successful do you think the Senegal Mission has been in decentralizing power?

Not successful		Moderately successful			Extremely successful	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

1.7 What are your comments on decentralization and delegation of authority in the Mission?

1.8 Give an estimate of what percentage of your time is spent on work within the Mission versus work outside with partners and customers:

1. _____ % Work within the Mission
2. _____ % Work outside with partners and customers

Communication

1.9 How do you rate your communication with USAID/W?

Inadequate	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

1.10 How do you rate your team's communication with other teams in the Mission?

Inadequate	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

1.11 How well do you think other teams in the Mission have communicated with your team in the past year? Respondent's Team: _____

Acquisition Core

Inadequate	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Admin/Core

Inadequate	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Admin Core/GSO

Inadequate	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

ANR Core

Inadequate	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

CAT Team

Inadequate	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

DIR Core

Inadequate	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

FM Core

Inadequate	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

1.11 How well do you think other teams in the Mission have communicated with your team in the past year? Respondent's Team: _____

HPN Core

Inadequate	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Info Core

Inadequate	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Program Core

Inadequate	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

SO#1 Team

Inadequate	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

SO#2 Team

Inadequate	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Conflict management (intra and inter team);

1.12 Has conflict in your team affected its ability to work together?

yes no

1.13 Has conflict between teams affected their ability to work together?

yes no

If yes go to 1.14

1.14 If conflict has been a problem, what do you think is its cause?

1.15 If conflict has been a problem, judge the quality of conflict management?

Inadequate	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Comments:

Vision, values and commitment

1.16 How committed do you feel to this vision and these values?

Not committed

Extremely Committed

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

Expectations and morale

1.17 What expectations that you had last year about a reengineered USAID/Senegal have materialized?

1.18 What expectations are still important yet unrealized?

1.19 What expectations are no longer important?

1.20 What was the impact on your team of the RIFs that took place in the last year?

1.21 What has been the impact on your team of the general climate of uncertainty existing within USAID?

Rewards and recognition

1.22 What would be a valued reward in recognition of your work?

1.23 Is your work adequately recognized?

yes

no

1.24 Is your work adequately rewarded?

yes

no

1.25 In what other ways would you like your efforts rewarded?

1.26 What kind of training have you personally received in the past year?

- a. Team building
- b. Information management
- c. Management skills
- d. Conflict management
- e. Technical training (List)
- f. Other (List)

B. Results and Innovations

1.27 What concrete results has your team achieved in the last year?

1.28 What are some innovations that your team has introduced in the last year?

1.29 Have you communicated your results and innovations to others (i.e. other teams, partners, USAID/W, other USAID Missions, virtual team members, etc.)?

yes (Go to 1.31) no (Go to 2.1)

1.30 To whom have you communicated your results and innovations?

1.31 How have you communicated your results and innovations?

2. TEAMWORK

2.1 How would you rate your team's overall relationship with other teams?

Inadequate	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

2.2 Do you have any noteworthy issues in relation to any specific team or teams?

2.3 Does your team have any virtual team members?

No (GO to 3.1)

Yes (GO to 2.4)

2.4 Who is/are the virtual team members?

2.5 What is the nature of their involvement with your team?

3. CORE TEAMS RELATIONSHIP WITH CUSTOMERS AND PARTNERS

Customers

3.1 What type of activities have you done with customers?

3.2 What has been rewarding about working with customers?

3.3 What has been difficult about working with customers?

3.7 How would you rate your relationship with customers?

Inadequate	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

3.12 How do your customers give you feedback about performance?

3.13 Has customer feedback ever been negative?

Yes (GO to 3.14)

No (GO to 3.15)

3.14 How did you address customer concerns expressed in negative feedback?

Partners

3.17 What type of activities have you done with partners?

(if none go to 4.1)

3.18 What has been rewarding about working with partners?

3.19 What has been difficult about working with partners?

3.20 How would you categorize your relationship with partners?

Inadequate	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

3.21 How do your partners give you feedback about performance?

3.22 Has partner feedback ever been negative?

Yes (GO to 3.14)

No (GO to 3.15)

3.23 How did you address partner concerns expressed in negative feedback?

4. RECOMMENDATIONS ON FUTURE REENGINEERING EFFORTS

4.1 How could the work of individual USAID/S teams improve?

4.2 How could inter-team work at USAID/S improve?

4.3 How could USAID/Senegal's work with customers improve?

4.4 How could USAID/Senegal's work with partners improve?

4.5 Are there any additional comments you would like to make?

Team: _____

0.0 ____ Coach ____ Team Member

0.1 ____ FSN ____ U.S.DH or RH

QUESTIONNAIRE — SOT COACHES/SO Team Members

1. ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE AND FUNCTIONING

1.1 On what team do you serve?

1.2 What is the mandate of this team?

1.3 How well do you feel the new organizational structure of USAID/S functions in terms of ability to:

1. respond more quickly to customer needs

Inadequate	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

2. respond more effectively to customer needs

Inadequate	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

3. avoid duplication of effort within USAID

Inadequate	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Roles and responsibilities

1.4 How do you define your role as coach/team member?

1.5 What has changed about your team's relationship with USAID/Washington?

1.6 How successful do you think the Senegal Mission has been in decentralizing power?

Not successful		Moderately succesful			Extremely successful	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

1.7 What are your comments on decentralization and delegation of authority in the Mission?

1.8 Give an estimate of what percentage of your time is spent on work within the Mission versus work outside with partners and customers:

1. _____ % work within the Mission
2. _____ % work outside with partners and customers

Communication

1.9 How do you rate your communication with USAID/W?

Inadequate	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

1.10 How do you rate your team's communication with other teams in the Mission?

Inadequate	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

1.11 How well do you think other teams in the Mission have communicated with your team in the past year? Respondent's Team: _____

Acquisition Core

Inadequate	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Admin/Core

Inadequate	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Admin Core/GSO

Inadequate	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

ANR Core

Inadequate	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

CAT Team

Inadequate	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

DIR Core

Inadequate	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

FM Core

Inadequate	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

1.11 How well do you think other teams in the Mission have communicated with your team in the past year? Respondent's Team: _____

HPN Core

Inadequate	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Info Core

Inadequate	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Program Core

Inadequate	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

SO#1 Team

Inadequate	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

SO#2 Team

Inadequate	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Conflict management (intra and inter team);

1.12 Has conflict in your team affected its ability to work together?

yes no

1.13 Has conflict between teams affected their ability to work together?

yes no

If yes go to 1.14

1.14 If conflict has been a problem, what do you think is its cause?

1.15 If conflict has been a problem, judge the quality of conflict management?

Inadequate	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Comments:

Vision, values and commitment

1.16 How committed do you feel to this vision and these values?

Not committed

Extremely Committed

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

Expectations and morale

1.17 What expectations that you had last year about a reengineered USAID/Senegal have materialized?

1.18 What expectations are still important yet unrealized?

1.19 What expectations are no longer important?

1.20 What was the impact on your team of the RIFs that took place in the last year?

1.21 What has been the impact on your team of the general climate of uncertainty existing within USAID?

Rewards and recognition

1.22 What would be a valued reward in recognition of your work?

1.23 Is your work adequately recognized?

yes

no

1.24 Is your work adequately rewarded?

yes

no

1.25 In what other ways would you like your efforts rewarded?

1.26 What kind of training have you personally received in the past year?

- a. Team building
- b. Information management
- c. Management skills
- d. Conflict management
- e. Technical training (List)
- f. Other (List)

B. Results and Innovations

1.27 What concrete results has your team achieved in the last year?

1.28 What are some innovations that your team has introduced in the last year?

1.29 Have you communicated your results and innovations to others (i.e. other teams, partners, USAID/W, other USAID Missions, virtual team members, etc.)?

yes (Go to 1.31)

no (Go to 2.1)

1.30 To whom have you communicated your results and innovations?

1.31 How have you communicated your results and innovations?

2. TEAMWORK

2.1 How would you rate your team's overall relationship with other teams?

Inadequate	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

2.2 Do you have any noteworthy issues in relation to any specific team or teams?

2.3 Does your team have any virtual team members?

No (GO to 3.1)

Yes (GO to 2.4)

2.4 Who is/are the virtual team members?

2.5 What is the nature of their involvement with your team?

3. SO TEAMS RELATIONSHIP WITH CUSTOMERS AND PARTNERS

Customers

3.1 What type of activities have you done with customers?

3.2 What has been rewarding about working with customers?

3.3 What has been difficult about working with customers?

3.4 Did you involve customers in developing your results frameworks (RFs)?

Yes

No

Explain:

3.5 Do you think customer priorities were addressed in the planning of the RFs?

Yes (GO to 3.6)

No (GO to 3.7)

Explain:

3.6 How did your team determine customer priorities?

1. Meetings
2. Focus groups
3. Surveys
4. Interviews
5. Observing customers
6. Documents and publications
7. Other (Explain)

3.7 How would you rate your relationship with customers?

Inadequate	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

3.8 Do you feel that reengineering has allowed your team to be in more frequent contact with customers?

yes (GO to 3.9) no (GO to 3.10)

3.9 How has this increased contact enabled you to be more effective in incorporating customer priorities into your Results Framework?

3.10 Do you expect to spend more time with customers within the next six months?

yes no

3.11 How does your team work together with customers to monitor results?

3.12 How do your customers give you feedback about performance?

3.13 Has customer feedback ever been negative?

Yes (GO to 3.14)

No (GO to 3.15)

3.14 How did you address customer concerns expressed in negative feedback?

Partners

3.17 What type of activities have you done with partners?

3.18 What has been rewarding about working with partners?

3.19 What has been difficult about working with partners?

3.20 Did you involve partners in developing your results frameworks (RFs)?

Yes No

Explain:

3.21 Do you think partner priorities were addressed in the planning of the RFs?

Yes (GO to 3.22) No (GO to 3.23)

Explain:

3.22 How did your team determine partner priorities?

1. Meetings
2. Focus groups
3. Surveys
4. Interviews
5. Observing customers
6. Documents and publications
7. Other (Explain)

3.23 How would you rate your relationship with partners?

Inadequate	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

3.24 Do you feel that reengineering has allowed your team to be in more frequent contact with partners?

yes (GO to 3.9) no (GO to 3.10)

3.25 How has this increased contact enabled you to be more effective in incorporating partner priorities into your Results Framework?

3.26 Do you expect to spend more time with partners within the next six months?

yes no

3.27 How does your team work together with partners to monitor results?

3.28 How do your partners give you feedback about performance?

3.29 Has partner feedback ever been negative?

Yes (GO to 3.14)

No (GO to 3.15)

3.14 How did you address partner concerns expressed in negative feedback?

4. RECOMMENDATIONS ON FUTURE REENGINEERING EFFORTS

4.1 How could the work of individual USAID/S teams improve?

4.2 How could inter-team work at USAID/S improve?

4.3 How could USAID/Senegal's work with customers improve?

4.4 How could USAID/Senegal's work with partners improve?

4.5 Are there any additional comments you would like to make?

QUESTIONNAIRE — CUSTOMERS/PARTNERS

3.0 Customer ____ Partner ____

3.1 What type of activity(ies) does USAID/Senegal engage in to serve your needs?

3.2 What are some examples of innovations and/or local initiatives that have been fostered in the last year as a result of USAID/Senegal's work with you?

3.3 Were you involved in planning the activity(ies) with USAID/Senegal?

Yes ____

No ____

Explain:

3.4 Do you feel your priorities were addressed in the planning process?

Yes ____

No ____

Explain:

3.5 How did USAID/Senegal discover your priorities?

3.5.1 Meetings ____
3.5.2 Focus Groups ____
3.5.3 Surveys ____
3.5.4 Interviews ____
3.5.5 Observation ____
3.5.6 Documents and Publications ____
3.5.7 Other ____
List: _____

3.6 How would you rate your relationship with USAID/Senegal?

Inadequate	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

3.7 Have you been informed of USAID/Senegal's new way of doing business with its focus on greater participation of its customers and partners at all stages of the development process?

Yes ____ No ____

3.8 In the last year has your face-to-face interaction with USAID/Senegal been more or less frequent?

More frequent ____ About the same ____ Less frequent ____

3.9 How well is USAID performing in terms of:

3.9.1 Timeliness

Inadequate	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

3.9.2 Reliability

Inadequate	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

3.9.3 Responsiveness

Inadequate	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

3.9.4 Other factor of concern (state)_____

Inadequate	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

3.10 Do you and USAID/Senegal work together to monitor results?

Yes ____ No ____

If yes, how do you do this?

3.11 How do you give feedback to USAID/Senegal about its performance?

3.12 Has your feedback ever been negative?

Yes ____ No ____

If yes, how were your concerns addressed?

3.13 Have you been involved in developing indicators of performance with USAID/Senegal?

Yes ____ No ____

3.14 If yes, what are these indicators of performance?

3.15 How would you characterize working with USAID/Senegal today versus 2-3 years ago?

Different OK Works well Same Needs Improvement

3.16 How does USAID/Senegal's performance compare to other organizations providing similar services?

Worse Same Better

3.17 What would you like to see USAID/Senegal do more of in their interaction with your organization?

3.18 What would you like to see USAID/Senegal do less of in their interaction with your organization?

Annex 2. Team Effectiveness Questionnaire

THE TEAM EFFECTIVENESS CRITIQUE

Indicate on the scales that follow your assessment of your team and the way it functions by circling the number on each scale that you feel is most descriptive of your team. In the space below each scale, please write down *specific examples of behaviors* that you have observed that explain why you selected that rating.

1. **Goals and Objectives**

There is a lack of commonly understood goals and objectives.

Team members understand and agree on goals and objectives.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2. **Utilization of Resources**

All member resources are not recognized and/or utilized.

Member resources are fully recognized and utilized.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3. **Trust and Conflict**

There is little trust among members and conflict is evident.

There is a high degree of trust among members and conflict is dealt with openly and worked through.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

4. **Leadership**
One person dominates and leadership roles are not carried out or shared.
- There is full participation in leadership; leadership roles are shared by members.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---

5. **Control and Procedures**
There is little control and there is a lack of procedures to guide team functioning.
- There are effective procedures to guide team functioning; team members support these procedures and regulate themselves.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---

6. **Interpersonal Communications**
Communications between members are closed and guarded.
- Communications between members are open and participative.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---

7. **Problem Solving/Decision Making**
The team has no agreed-on approaches to problem solving and decision making.

The team has well-established and agreed-on approaches to problem solving and decision making.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---

8. **Experimentation/Creativity**
The team is rigid and does not experiment with how things are done.

The team experiments with different ways of doing things and is creative in its approach.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---

9. **Evaluation**
The group never evaluates its functioning or process.

The group often evaluates its functioning and process.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Annex 3. Team Effectiveness Comments

QUALITATIVE DATA FROM TEAM EFFECTIVENESS CRITIQUE.

1. GOALS and OBJECTIVES

INFO CORE

We are not really functioning as a team.

There is not a real team.

EXO staff has already submitted their objectives to the EXO. (*individual work plan objectives submitted--not team*)

ADMIN CORE and ADMIN/GSO CORE

ADM core has not finished yet to reengineer. When we finish, I hope that there will be a common understanding of goals and objectives.

I sent my work objectives to the executive officer a few days ago and I'm waiting for its implementation.

ANR CORE

Never discussed common purpose and goal. We were just sitting together.

Team members held several discussion meetings to define and agree on goals/objectives.

The goals and objectives of ANR Unit are well understood by all members who collaboratively have defined them. However, each team member within ANR unit has his specific SOW.

ACQ CORE

No comments —only 1 questionnaire returned.

FM CORE

There is a general lack of focus of what this team is all about. Namely because of the major shock caused by staff turnover was not dealt with properly.

Members know goals but are not well prepared to look at the same directions.

Work on team with optimism, integrity, honesty, mutual respect transparency.

Paradigm shift not yet in effect within the collaborative efforts of team members. Customer concept between sections of the core team not well understood or abuse of the concept

experienced in instance where members rely on others to do work inherently they are supposed to do.

There is a general lack of focus of what this team is all about. Mainly because of the major shock caused by staff turnover was not dealt with properly.

Members will meet together, they will determine course of action. In addition, they will contact other team members when the situation requires marked improvement.

Each team member has specific goals and objectives to achieve and FM Core has in place defined goals and objectives.

In this connection, there is a high degree of trust and all members of the team work together to meet Mission requirements.

The end of fiscal year maximum of vouchers have to be processed , all the team members work hard to finish the job.

SO#1 TEAM

Because this area is health area and concerning AIDS, population and child survival in developing country like Senegal. Also goals and objectives are well-defined by the Mission Director.

"Goals" have been de-emphasized in recent USAID internal reforms and I've not once heard anyone in SOT#1 invoke "goals" even in the context of recent SO1 Ag preparation and negotiations (tho I have done so.) Objectives (defined by RPs) are somewhat more clear, though they are diverse (e.g., fertility; reduction, STD and AIDS control, health systems reform, child survival, maternal health and some others, including simply managing a huge number of US - based contractors

Score 5 for project/4 for team/2 for individuals. We have clear objectives for the project, but have not made it a priority to define exactly how the team will function— what exactly must we do to achieve these. Project objectives have been EXTENSIVELY discussed and negotiated with partners and everyone is well aware of them. We have discussed roles and responsibilities at length in reengineering process and design of results packages, but have not set down a clear team action plan for SOT #1 in that framework. This is the next step and needs attention now. Team is deficient in action planning by individuals. We have not focused on attainment of objectives by individuals, or been able to provide any direct and concrete consequences for either high or low performance. As a result, staff members have little incentive to do proper action planning and follow up. FSN performance would and the work environment would drastically change were rewards and sanction effectively linked to performance. I believe also that the Senegalese cultural context, in which virtually everything is negotiable, mitigates against clearly defined responsibilities and performance targets for individuals. This could lead to embarrassment by the accountable party if they did not perform and the culture (and that of the Mission and SOT#1) seeks to minimize this.

SOT#2

Implication of all team members in the development of RF/RP. Goals and objectives have been discussed several times within the team.

Even Admin. Asst. can tell you our objectives. Discussed repeatedly at meetings.

18 months of work together has made us get common understanding of the team goals and objectives.

Ability of team members to fill in for their colleagues.

The team is functioning very well. Information is passing better in all members of the team. For example: Each employee is an active of an strategic activity implementation team.

Team members fully understand and agree on goals and objectives as they work in completely integrated teams focused on reaching commonly understood goals (those of the RPs) and objectives (the Strategic Objective.)

Everybody tried to reach goals and objectives that are assigned to the team.

People do not always understand the goals and objectives.

SOT#4

To build SOT4 a series of meetings were held by all members (full-time and part-time) to reach a common vision and development the team's statement of work and objectives.

Many meetings were convened at the beginning of the team's formation. From the discussions that took place it was possible to shape everybody's understanding of what the team's objectives were.

Team members take sufficient time to explain their understanding of goals/objectives so that common understanding was reached.

It took some time but the team finally agreed on what we were supposed to achieve.

CAT TEAM

Our administrative assistant can assign actions based on this common understanding of goals and objectives.

2. UTILIZATION OF RESOURCES

ADMIN CORE

I sent my work objectives to the Executive Officer a few days ago and I'm waiting for its implementation.

ANR CORE

No. I was sitting there but was working outside the team.

When someone from the team gives ideas, they are welcomed.

Member resources are fully recognized and utilized within the ANR Unit. It is too bad that as a technical office other teams, particularly SOT#2, do not fully use nor appreciate our experts because they don't seem to understand our role.

FM CORE

Some FSNs in FM Core have the educational background and technical skills to perform the functions of Deputy Coaches for FM Core.

Members are certainly utilized but not to accomplish what they can do best. Recognition lacks a great deal, especially among team members.

Portions of the job are left undone while resources exist . Work distribution (portfolio) not equitable.

There exist potentials within the team which are not fully utilized.

Some people are empowered. Some position reclassifications are done but not yet approved by the EXO.

Members are certainly utilized but not to accomplish what they can do best. Recognition lacks a great deal, specifically among team members.

Members reinforce each other's resources and/or pool them to achieve results.

Unfair situation created between employees grade (some have too much work and are undergraded).

Sometimes a conflict appears when the treatment of the employee is unfair. No evaluation, now award, same salary however the job she/he performs in not glamorous.

Polyvalence is needed.

SOT#1

The roles/responsibilities of lower level staff not yet fully understood and solicited.

Reengineering is flexible and was reviewed putting the right person in the right place.

Team member's skills are recognized in the daily allocation of incoming tasks (correspondence, cables, calls, meeting participation outside USAID, etc.) and in the pattern of reinforcement people give to each other.

Human resource utilization is not optimal. In general, SOT#1 members operate with great autonomy and report back to coach and team on progress. It is against the team mind set we have created to give directives to or closely supervise individuals. This creates a comfortable work environment on the surface, but does not assure that all work will be completed and some members could benefit from more rigorous supervision than currently applied. Some team members are high-performing and action-oriented while others are not, and do not engage their expertise or management time to its potential to move SOT#1 toward objectives. It is frustrating and demotivating to an overworked top performer to see colleagues without enough to do, or whom they might consider not to be pulling their weight. Staff work planning and performance will show a meaningful change when USAID can offer direct, concrete rewards for high performance and either sanctions or conspicuous lack of these awards for non-performing staff. Until this happens, I predict our best performers will continue to be frustrated and cultural sensibilities will continue to keep this an unspoken issue.

We have different backgrounds in the team and before making any important decision we sit together, discuss the issues and share the tasks based on backgrounds.

SOT#2

Member resources are fully recognized and utilized.

All members resources are utilized because every facilitator can replace each other.

There is a clear recognition of individual skills and responsibilities. The team work is based on fully utilizing these skills and responsibilities.

Member resources are fully recognized and utilized. For example: Admin. Ass'ts. are utilized in activities. Which are not under their work objectives, but they can handle them because they have the resources and the competence.

Everyone in the team seems to be satisfied with his/her role.

All resources are recognized but not all are fully utilized.

We could do better to expand horizon of some staff members — need combination of internal push and external reinforcement and encouragement —example: Admin. Asst now

doing job of Asst. Facilitator.

We have different backgrounds in the team and before making any important decision we sit together, discuss the issues and share the tasks based on backgrounds.

SOT#4

Depending on the nature of a given task, the right team member would volunteer with other's full agreement.

Members of the teams were utilized at best given the specificity of this team where most members were part-time members of many other teams.

Though member resources are fully recognized, the full utilization was sometimes hampered by the fact that at critical times some members are requested to participate in other teams as part-time members.

All resources were used., i.e., doing a PIOT took with half a day including our outside partner (UPA).

CAT TEAM

Encouragement to participate shows from time to time unknown or underutilized resources. We are learning how to build on all resources.

3. TRUST and CONFLICT

ANR CORE

There was conflict always, but no resolution. We were sending e-mail to each other to explain why we did this or that and there were constant conflicts.

When a team member says something he is confident because of trust which exists within the team.

Mutual respect has brought about high degree of trust among team members, which in turn minimizes conflicts.

The ANR unit is a small and technical office. It is composed of multi-disciplinary staffers who can discuss professionally and objectively issues, concerns and conflicts without putting forward subjective and personal matters.

SOT#1

Team members have a high degree of trust amongst themselves. Personally, we are a tight and cohesive group, comfortable in each others' personal space and taking part to varying

degrees in family affairs. Professionally, we count on each other to back us up or defend us to outside forces in project/program discussions. One team member will not take decisions in another's portfolio or obvious "turf" without consulting and will defer to the "specialist", though each member generally feels free to express their own opinions. Team members know work habits and capacities of the SOT#1 colleagues and will "trust" high-priority actions to him/her who they think will get results. This refers to question 2, where not all members perform at the same level, and so are not entrusted with the same level of responsibility or representation. Conflict: "Public praise —private punishment" is the general rule. Colleagues will have frank discussions in private when in serious disagreement. This is easier with a precipitating event but is difficult to address general habits. In general, team functions without internal conflict or great tension. On numerous occasions virtually everyone has rallied to get major work out the door or confront the forces of evil outside the team.

Due to appropriate size of the team governed by transparency and motivation.

I never hear of complaints or back-biting from anyone about others in the team. The team and I spend quiet time with each person with opportunities for such expression. There are some work style differences that lead some members to prefer working or conferring more often with certain other members but no one is isolated and the networking seems very healthy.

SOT#2

We always try to reach a consensus. Some people may agree, some may not. But we make people understand that once a decision is made or a consensus reached, this should be fully supported by all team members.

Within SOT2 trust is high, conflicts are discussed openly — with ANR there is little trust.

No critical conflicts that I know of.

There are no taboos for the team. Weekly meetings are an opportunity to discuss all issues openly.

There is little conflict among members. Except between SOT2 and ANR Core because of lack of communication.

There is a good spirit of trust and collaboration among team members within SOT2. So far, we have not had to deal with conflicts between members.

If there is a conflict we sit and resolve it openly and by all the team.

FM CORE

All employees of team from bottom to top refer directly to coach for whatever problems arise, even in instances where other staff could help out. instances of anonymous letters

criticizing the operational staff not work distribution, might threatening battles have been heard and discussed/brought up with EXO and Controller.

Needs to work out confidence within team.

An open letter was distributed to our team members a few months ago on which some are from the FM Core Unit were given some suggestions to the Director. A kind of this letter means that there are some conflicts in our team members.

Conflict is a daily reality in this team and I doubt the work "trust" could be used to qualify how team members feel about each other.

There is periodic, minor conflict between some team members, this sometimes extends and impacts trust.

This happened in the past, but is not continuous.

CAT TEAM

This has to be improved, despite efforts devoted to trust and conflict. Sometimes, one on one discussions is preferred to open discussions.

SOT#4

Any issue or conflict is always ??? and discussed during a meeting with all team members at the request of any one member who feels concerned by something. There has never been a one-by-one meeting and everyone avoids to cause frustration.

As the team worked together and common understanding was improved and concerns shared, the team actually demonstrated an amazing mutual respect among its members.

Especially, team members respect each other. This minimized the occurrence of conflicts.

4. LEADERSHIP

SO#1

Coach has strong natural leadership qualities, including humor and a broad array of tools to deal with differing work styles of colleagues and counterparts. Team members defer to coaches' decisions due to her technical confidence/competence and knowledge of the AID machine. Consultative process is generally followed so that team "owns" the decisions which leave the office. Fatimata is normally replaced as coach by Chris or Massaer. The coach position in SOT#1 is really one of facilitative manager, rather than a boss giving directions. I feel that SOT#1 also recognized its leadership role in the Mission and at AID/W — we have instigated a number of processes and movements which have later been taken

up by other teams or G Bureau. I continue to push team members to be aggressive and innovative in this way, as the guidance we seek often has not yet been written.

All decisions have been taken after consultation and inputs from all members.

Leadership as I understand it even after several management courses (including with L. Cooley) is perhaps not as divisible as implied in this scale. The coach is a dynamo, a "natural leader" to whom most people learn readily to defer. SOT1 members recognize, however, that they have to take decisions even though they may prefer to check with her on most things because they trust her judgment more than their own. The coach is superb at delegating and encouraging others to "prendre l'action." The Deputy Coach, likewise, is naturally strong and takes initiative easily. He reinforces the coach's leadership. One member loves to politic and talk and press the flesh like a politician and he has carved out activities when he often can do this while meeting SOT1 needs.

SOT#2

Everybody participates in our team and shares views in staff meeting.

Depending on the type of activity or assignment, leader roles have been frequently revolving.

There is a full participation in leadership. The coach has distributed responsibilities among the team members. Each member has an important role to play on the SOT.

The Coach always seeks for our opinion in group or on one-by-one basis for matters affecting the team as a whole. Also, she gives a chance to each.

In most cases whoever has the expertise in the subject matter or activity to deal with takes the lead. Voluntary assignment are also used when activity does not fall into a specific speciality.

SAIT facilitators perform leadership role on on-going basis. Sharing leadership is encouraged in meetings and all actions.

Still based on the different backgrounds. The team always as one team member to take the lead on a specific action.

FM CORE

We have 1 FSN Deputy Coach.

Members still need more guidance and mentoring skills among leaders.

A great system of control is put in place and there is full participation.

Lack of organizational layout (with clear, formal organization chart) not utilized to team members. Although with single person (FSN) less to the Coach, leadership actors have ?? and need to be supported by the management.

It's hard to judge this one. Leadership was not really devoted to team members other than the coach or deputy coach. Yet, leadership was not exercised in a way to dominate the team. Let's put it that way, leadership was sort of "diluted" or loose.

Team members take initiatives, some indicate stronger leadership qualities than others.

Our coach has given FSNs the opportunity to undertake positions such as Deputy Coach (Deputy Controller) which was historically and traditionally an USDH position.

CAT TEAM

Leadership roles are distributed according to type of activities/actions to be carried out.

ANR CORE TEAM

There is a boss, with a nickname "Negus."

Each team member has a precise role to play.

Although the ANR unit is made of various expertise, our work is inter-related and to reach our unit's goals and objectives, we are aware that there should be continuous flow of information among us on a daily basis. The fact that we are a small team of professionals facilitates participation and communication. We are interchangeable.

ADMIN CORE

Tout le staff travaille ensemble de consens se consulte pour to decis-finale event le faire un travail.

SOT#4

Meetings are held in a way that delegations of authority are fully understood.

This would be one of the most remarkable factors in the success of this team. Leadership was provided by the team's coach, who in turn sought everyone's input when decisions were to be made. We had a feeling that our points were taken into account.

When the team is tasked with a specific assignment the member who has the required skills would take the lead with the help of other members.

5. CONTROL AND PROCEDURES

INFO CORE

There is no.

SOT#1

We have established ground rules for team member portfolio management and technical action responsibilities which function well and provide a transparent working environment. SOT#1 has taken full to heart delegation of authority issues and seeks to complete as much work as possible within the team. Contracting, financial and other specialists on the team are fully utilized in control of these items.

Frameworks for reengineering report and delegation of authority produced by Task Force are followed.

I rarely actually see the Coach or Deputy Coach requesting others to do something. Work is divided, people confer, actions are reviewed at regular SOT or ad hoc meetings. Checklists are used and the needful seems to get done.

SOT#2

Procedures before reengineering still in effect. However, DOAs help clarify functioning of team as clearance process.

Generally effective but, there are still some areas of uncertainty due to reengineering where our roles and authorities are not quite clear i.e., who can sign waivers, PIO/Ps etc.

Procedures are not always clearly defined but team works it out the most efficient way.

The routing of our documents for approval of other team members ensures control. Also our working norms posted in the conference room are a good example, among others.

There is not enough control and procedures are not very clear up to now. Sometimes there is a conflict between what is not authorized what is authorized and to what extent. EX: Delegation of Authorities, etc.

Procedures are well established and team is functioning based on them.

Control of what?

FM CORE

Handbooks, Mission Orders, standardized regulations, etc.

Members can function almost with little supervision.

We are working, based on procedures which have a positive impact on team performance.

Existing procedures are either not well understood or unsupported by team members, probably because of lack of efficient coordination/supervision for their adherence.

Main problem. Actually, this is where the team's problems stem from.

As much as possible. Periodically need to be reinforced.

Handbooks, Mission Orders, Financial Operating procedures and policies, etc.

We are getting used with the ECS and the NMS courses is still going on. Congratulations to Mamadou N. And Vincent G. for their support and the job well done.

In accounting control and procedures are needed.

CAT TEAM

Sometimes, we feel the lack of procedures to guide team functioning. Some would go to other members to check what procedures to follow under specific actions.

ANR CORE TEAM

No team, so no procedures.

Procedures are not clearly defined at the outset. However, these procedures are set up as the team moved along.

I will not give a mark to this question because we really don't have "effective procedures" not to guide team functioning. We have a flexible and efficient system depending on circumstances and issue. We review according to needs which allows us to meet deadlines, based on an approved time frame. We are not procedural and do not want to be tied up to regulations and procedures. We negotiate our time with the other teams we belong to and we undertake to fulfill what we are asked to do.

SOT#4

In the team statement, team members have agreed upon how the team would function.

This may have been one of the weaknesses of the team. The procedures were not formalized enough. However, generally accepted discipline helped avoid chaos.

Holding minutes of meeting facilitated the teams work, the minutes always highlighted tasks to be completed by who and when.

6. INTERPERSONAL COMMUNICATIONS

SOT#1

SOT#1 members communicate freely and often engage in lively debate over program and other issues. It is permissible to disagree if you can bring reasonable arguments to the table. Interpersonal problems are normally dealt with between interested parties and either resolved or people agree to disagree.

See #4. Every Monday morning we have a coordination meeting to review all aspects of problems.

A team member and I had a big difference of opinion about the appropriateness of sharing a controversial Herald Tribune article on family planning in Islam. I met (?) with the Minister of Health, GOS officials, NGOs and the press. He independently consulted with a key GOS director the USAID Director and with humor and persistence advocated his position at the SOT1 meeting. We disagreed strongly, but openly. I went on to do what I intended, but, he made his point. I believe this SOT group has excellent participative communication.

SOT#2

We always communicate of what happened by e-mail or setting up meetings — everybody is well-informed.

There is a good spirit of open communication, participation and collaboration.

Lack of communication between a few members of team. For example: SOT2 and ANR have very big problem of interpersonal communication.

E-mail is efficiently used to keep every member up to date with on going activities or events.

Our team interacts very effectively. There is a sort of synergy that carries team beyond our individual capacity. This is dampened with negativity sometimes imposed from some ANR Core individuals.

Regular staff meetings. The way the office space is set helps improve communication. No closed doors.

FM CORE

Interpersonal communication is good, however, it needs to be improved.

(Score=2) Even though it's not evident, it's always said that this is particular to this team. Why?

Clear communication. Clarity in team hierarchy. Awareness of group process. Coordination with appropriate staff in other divisions.

There are a little communication between team members.

Communications (when participatory) are limited to the very strict ??? during formal audience or official contact. To the large majority , personal communication is not among separate groups and/or followers.

Very poor. A lot of events illustrate this.

Needs work!!

Staff meetings are held very often.

One person keeps information for himself and doesn't want to share with others.

After each staff meeting we receive a briefing from a member and discuss about some points.

CAT TEAM

Except in cases of conflict.

ANR CORE TEAM

Communication by e-mail. No staff meeting, we never went to an outside meeting and took a position on the issue discussed.

E-mail and meetings are used to communicate in an open and participative manner.

All team members are free to talk at any time and they are listened to.

See texts under questions 1,2,3,4. Also there are a lot of informal meetings. We often have lunch together. We also make use of e-mail. We are also all part-timers in other implementing so team and communications become an important tool to be informative and better reflect the view of the ANR unit.

ADMIN CORE

Information circule rapidement su nivea de notre unite's orale comme note pour les absents pour ??? soient informer de ce ??? se passe.

I'm working in the Personnel Division as an Assistant and I have my action/info in the daily activities.

SOT#4

The e-mail system and direct discussion have eased openness and participation.

This relates to item 3 and 4. Since trust and respect existed among team members it was possible to communicate openly without undue hard feelings.

In addition to regular weekly meetings, the team would hold ad-hoc meeting with everyone's participation, should one team member have a point of discussion.

7. PROBLEM SOLVING/DECISION MAKING

SOT#1

SOT#1 has a positive approach to decision making and problem solving involving team members and other partners when appropriate. This process normally is most effective when one member brings draft solutions to the table for consultation and modification. Emphasis is on product, so discussion and modification generally accepted if it means improvement.

I circle 3 because 2 people are just assigned to the team 2 months ago.

SOT1 meetings are very regular, efficient and integral to the division of labor and to tracking actions. SOT1 completes a steady, high stream of work with quality and timeliness. There is an accepted, respected order in decision making with the Coach being well apprised of issues and quickly decisively resolving issues when others can not. The Deputy Coach carries the bulk of work requiring computer and quantitative skills and large documents.

SOT#2

Participatory approach in decision making. No clear approach yet for problem/conflict solving.

Decision making is well established and decentralized. . . Problem solving system with "activities" also well defined. Problem solving is less well ordered at team level. Problem topics are usually raised as people recognize them as problems and they are discussed as team and solutions brainstormed/recommendations agreed and implemented when it is within our power.

Tools: meeting, general; one-on-one meeting; open forum through e-mail; documents distribution and review.

Same as in #4.

Some of the problems can be solved by a group approach by the team, but others are beyond the team and decisions should be made by -at a higher level.

The team spirit and participatory approach to problem solving and decision making have been functioning well.

FM CORE

There is a management approach which has not been subject to discussion/clearance with staff members.

Needs to be worked on.

There is mutual agreement on the roles and responsibilities.

No such experience has been noted — to my knowledge.

The team members could not agree upon approaches where leadership is unclear, procedures not defined and interpersonal communication is reduced to a minimum. Actually, the team spirit simply does not exist.

Needs work and definition and clarity. The basics are there.

Inputs from every team member is considered, to facilitate the decision making process.

INFO CORE

Nous n'avons pas encore expérimenté le reengineering donc il nous est très difficile de dire que nous travaillons en équipe. Le EXO team n'est pas encore fonctionnel pour résoudre un quelconque problème.

CAT TEAM

The approaches exist, but are not systematically followed in case of problems.

ANR CORE TEAM

Discussion meetings are held to solve problems such as those faced in other teams as ANR team members participate in other team on a part-time basis.

No communication, no "agree on course."

Refer back to questions 1 and 2.

ADMIN CORE

Nous avons une bonne manière de résoudre les problèmes entre collègues le service.

Espirit d'e quipe.

SOT#4

As stated above in 4,5 and 6, the team has set some rules of conduct to solve problems or make a decision. It is always done in a participatory manner and decisions are based on a consensus.

This team mainly dealt with analytical issues. Therefore rigid approaches on solving problems were maybe not appropriate. However, effective communication on each topic got us where we wanted to be.

Discussion of ideas have directed decision making and problem solving.

8. EXPERIMENTATION/CREATIVITY

SOT#1

SOT#1 has been pushing reengineering to try to make it work for us and has come a long way. (Ref#6) Still people are resistant to change in many areas. We do not take advantage of the technology available in the Mission — computer system is main example. Team should be more aggressive about training its members in effective use of computer programs, network, internet e-mail and internet Web sites. Some of this is fear of change — some is simply that people are not willing to take the time to learn a new and faster method/tool, so they stick with an old (sometimes counterproductive) version or work-around.

I started working with the SOT#1 only since July 8, 1996.

SOT1 has no doubt been very experimental during the past 2 years. The team now is achieving a more productive equilibrium with its new members and recently established clearer RFS. They search creative solutions to issues posed by a very conservative physician dominated Ministry of Health — their success has been limited but not due to lack of effort.

SOT#2

The team has for the past year been constantly engaged in experimenting/innovating with new processes, new ways of functioning. One good example is how SOT2 can move from SAIT to RP teams.

The team experiments with different ways of doing things. With the reengineering the way of doing business has changed.

The team is creative indeed. This was well illustrated with our SAG writing: the tem did not want to simply copy or adapt SAG!

Mostly in cases where procedures are not specifically or clearly defined.

No really experiments but participatory approach through brainstorming, open discussion.

FM CORE

No experimentation, some creativity among some members, but not well organized.

We set rules or norms of work to ensure that teams are fully involved in the reengineering process.

Maybe with NMS.

From the strict technical stand point (job knowledge) only.

Again, a lot of turf guarding.

The whole team approach and concept is an innovation and transcends how team members operate.

We work as a team. We all participate to achieve best results.

CAT TEAM

In the past "Training Unit" staff were concerned with only training — PVO/NGO Unit staff were involved in PVO/NGO activities only. Now interaction and participation in both units is encouraged. Decisions are made by the team.

ANR CORE TEAM

NO. No team at all.

The ANR unit team is very creative and proactive. We don't lock ourselves to an iron cast methodology. We are flexible depending on issues, partners. We are always questioning ourselves the SO Teams on mission approaches to improve our ways of doing business. This puts us (ANR Unit members) into difficulty when dealing with the other teams doing the things in a routine way.

SOT#4

Team members discuss ways of doing things and agree upon a consensual way to proceed.

Different backgrounds were present in this team. Since everybody was eager to make a contribution, it was rather common that innovative approaches were suggested.

The team has started to invite other staff of the Mission to attend some of its meetings to

familiarize them with what the team is trying to achieve. Likewise, the team often times informally invited the front office just to share information.

9. EVALUATION

SOT#1

I am very new on this team. I cannot answer.

The team falls down a bit in this area of critical evaluation of processes and internal operations. There are a number of improvements which would make our lives easier if we would look seriously at how we now function. Again, the issue of taking time to do this and assigning priority to more effective function to achieve clear team objectives gets lost in the sea of urgent actions.

I cannot say anything about this because I am beginner in this team. I was transferred from SOT#2 to SOT#1 in July, 1996.

The Coach and Deputy Coach have imbued SOT1 with a very positive self-critical approach to work. I see this in their meetings where, e.g., people who are behind are never criticized, rather the group quickly searches for ways to break bottlenecks, and/or ask for volunteers to help on another, etc.

SOT#2

No evaluation — need to do it.

Team does not always have time to step back and evaluate itself due to work load pressure. Usually happens when crisis peaks. Certain reengineering changes are ongoing and do cause us to evaluate as we prepare for next steps of changes (i.e., for implementing RPs)

Not formally but feedback is provided sometimes (written or oral).

I believe that this is achieved through our staff meetings.

The group evaluates its functioning by means of frequent meetings inside and outside the group, weekly meetings.

This is ongoing presently.

FM CORE

Operating processes and procedures (management controls).

Needs to be set up and followed.

Monitoring the system in order to adjust some changes (after the RIF for example).

As part of annual management control evaluation exercise. This is addressed.

The team did try on some instances to evaluate its functioning, but never reached conclusions on any substantive problem. Issues are dealt with in a superficial manner and decisions not made, therefore maintaining the status quo.

Team has not fully come to this realization. There are signs of "life!"

For FIA: Conducted and reported on as Annual basis.

CAT TEAM

We have done this once in a year's time.

ANR CORE TEAM

The team discussed work schedule to take into account participation to other teams.

Never!

We always question members and make a new start from lessons learned. We don't n??
Ourselves for the work well done. We try to identify the constraint, problems we meet to
overcome them. Questioning ourselves is a continuous process in the ANR Unit. This is our
label.

ADMIN CORE

Des reivions sont tenues chage fin de semaine.

Admin core is beginning the process to reengineer. We have a good EXO and a good team.
There are a few "spirits" confused/insecure but overall great progress. Mr. Chessin's arrival.
I help when and where I can.

SOT#4

From the development of its vision and objectives statement, to the preparation of its RF
and RPs the team regularly reviewed, evaluated, adjusted its functioning and process as
to be sure to go to the right direction in achieving its objective.

We did this rarely. Maybe because of the pace of activities. However, we still kept a clear
focus on what needed to be accomplished.

The group has set up a work schedule which is frequently reviewed and adjusted in light
of achievement.